

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

CATALOG DOCUMENTATION  
EMAP-GREAT LAKES PROGRAM LEVEL DATABASE  
1994 LAKE SUPERIOR NEARSHORE  
SEDIMENT TOXICITY TEST DATA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. DATA SET IDENTIFICATION
2. INVESTIGATOR INFORMATION
3. DATA SET ABSTRACT
4. OBJECTIVES AND INTRODUCTION
5. DATA ACQUISITION AND PROCESSING METHODS
6. DATA MANIPULATIONS
7. DATA DESCRIPTION
8. GEOGRAPHIC AND SPATIAL INFORMATION
9. QUALITY CONTROL/QUALITY ASSURANCE
10. DATA ACCESS
11. REFERENCES
12. TABLE OF ACRONYMS
13. PERSONNEL INFORMATION

1. DATA SET IDENTIFICATION

1.1 Title of Catalog document

EMAP-Great Lakes Program Level Database  
1994 Lake Superior Nearshore  
Sediment Toxicity Test Data

1.2 Authors of the Catalog entry

Jenny Kysely, ILS

1.3 Catalog revision date

2 February 1997

1.4 Data set name

LSTOX94

## 1.5 Task Group

Great Lakes

## 1.6 Data set identification code

525

## 1.7 Version

001

## 1.8 Requested Acknowledgment

These data were produced as part of the U. S. EPA 's Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP). If you plan to publish these data in any way, EPA requires a standard statement for work it has supported:

"Although the data described in this article has been funded wholly or in part by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency through its EMAP-Great Lakes Program, it has not been subjected to Agency review, and therefore does not necessarily reflect the views of the Agency and no official endorsement should be inferred."

## 2. INVESTIGATOR INFORMATION

### 2.1 Principal Investigator

Stephen Lozano  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
NHEERL-MED

### 2.2 Investigation Participant - Sample Collection

Floyd Boetcher  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
NHEERL-MED

### 2.3 Investigation Participant - Sample Collection

Gary Phipps  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
NHEERL-MED

### 2.4 Investigation Participant - Sample Collection

James Gangl  
SAIC  
(Currently, University of Minnesota)

### 2.5 Investigation Participant - Sample Processing

Jill Scharold  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
NHEERL-MED

### 3. DATA SET ABSTRACT

#### 3.1 Abstract of the Data Set

The Lake Superior Sediment Toxicity Test data set provides summary data on sediment toxicity tests for twenty-two sampling stations located along the southern shore of the nearshore region of Lake Superior. A 500-1000 mL subsample from the 0-5 cm layer was collected with a Ponar into a 1000 mL plastic jar and refrigerated for sediment bioassays. A 10-day sediment toxicity test was conducted using the amphipod *Hyaella azteca* and the midge *Chironomus tentans*. Endpoints measured include survival and growth.

#### 3.2 Keywords for the Data Set

Sediment toxicity test, nearshore region, Lake Superior, amphipod, *Hyaella azteca*, midge, *Chironomus tentans*

### 4. OBJECTIVES AND INTRODUCTION

#### 4.1 Program Objective

The Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) was designed to periodically estimate the status and trends of the Nation's ecological resources on a regional basis. EMAP provides a strategy to identify and bound the extent, magnitude and location of environmental degradation and improvement on a regional scale based on station sites randomly located in the Great Lakes. Base grid and three-fold enhanced sampling sites from nearshore Lake Superior are included in this data set.

#### 4.2 Data Set Objective

The primary objective of the sediment toxicity test is to characterize the benthic macroinvertebrate community. The toxicity of Lake Superior sediments to the amphipod *Hyaella azteca* and the midge *Chironomus tentans* was estimated in a 10-day, solid-phase bioassay.

#### 4.3 Background Discussion

Sediment toxicity tests are the most direct measure available for determining sediment contaminant effects in benthic communities. These tests provide information of direct measurements of contaminants on aquatic biota since many chemicals are bound tightly to sediment particles or are complexed which makes them biologically unavailable.

Survival and growth in these laboratory bioassays provide evaluations of toxic contaminants without requiring interpretation of how complex mixtures might interact to affect biota.

Both *Hyaella azteca* and *Chironomus tentans* have many desirable attributes of an ideal sediment toxicity testing organism including relative sensitivity to contaminants associated with sediment, short generation time, contact with sediment, ease of culture in the lab, and tolerance to varying physico-chemical characteristics of sediments.

#### 4.4 Summary of Data Set Parameters

A summary of replicate sediment toxicity test results were compared to summary test control data. The ten-day test was conducted with the amphipod *Hyalella azteca* and the midge *Chironomus tentans*. Each sediment sample was thoroughly mixed and added to the test chambers.

### 5. DATA ACQUISITION AND PROCESSING METHODS

#### 5.1 Data Acquisition

##### 5.1.1 Sampling Objective

To collect a 500-1000 mL subsample from the 0-5 cm layer from 22 sampling sites from the nearshore region of Lake Superior. A Ponar grab was used to obtain the sediment samples which were placed in a 1000 mL plastic jar and refrigerated for sediment bioassays with two freshwater organisms.

##### 5.1.2 Sample Collection Methods Summary

A Ponar grab sampler was used for collection of benthic macroinvertebrate samples. Approximately, a 500-1000 mL subsample was collected for toxicity testing. Samples were stored at 4 deg C and transported back to the lab for analysis.

##### 5.1.3 Beginning Sampling Date

8 August 1994

##### 5.1.4 Ending Sampling Date

20 August 1994

##### 5.1.5 Platform

Sampling was conducted from a 28 meter research vessel, the R/V Explorer, owned and operated by the U.S. EPA, NHEERL-MED.

##### 5.1.6 Sampling Equipment

A Ponar grab was used to collect sediment samples.

##### 5.1.7 Manufacturer of Instrument

##### 5.1.8 Key Variables

This data set does not contain any values which were measured at the time of collection. Analysis of the data after completion of the tests produced summary tests.

##### 5.1.9 Collection Method Calibration

The sampling gear required no calibration.

#### 5.1.10 Collection Quality Control

Prior to sampling at each station, the Ponar grab sampler was washed and rinsed with ambient water to ensure that no sediment remained from a previous station.

#### 5.1.11 Sample Collection Method Reference

Strobel, C. J. and S. C. Schimmel, 1991. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program-Near Coastal. 1991 Virginian Province, Field Operations and Safety Manual. U.S. EPA, NHEERL-AED, Narragansett, RI. June 1991.

### 5.2 Data Processing and Sample Processing

#### 5.2.1 Sample Processing Objective

To process sediment samples for characterization of sediment toxicity to the amphipod *Hyalella azteca* and the midge *Chironomus tentans*.

#### 5.2.2 Sample Processing Methods Summary

Each test consisted of a 100 mL sediment sample and 175 mL of overlying water placed in a 300 mL test chamber. Tests were conducted for 10 days under a solid phase at 23 deg C with a 16L:8D photoperiod at an illuminance of about 500-1000 lux. Two freshwater test species were used, the amphipod *Hyalella azteca* and the midge *Chironomus tentans*.

Control treatments used the same water, conditions, procedures, and organisms as the other test treatments, except that none of the test material was added to the control sediment or water. The control treatments were used to provide: a) a measure of the acceptability of the test by providing evidence of the health and relative quality of the test organisms, and the suitability of the overlying water, test conditions, and handling procedures, etc.; and b) the basis for interpreting data obtained from the test sediments.

Survival and growth endpoints were determined after exposure to test sediment for 10 days. At the end of the 10 day exposure, any of the surviving test organisms in the water column or on the surface of the sediment were pipetted from the beaker before sieving the sediment. Immobile organisms isolated from the sediment surface or from sieved material were considered dead. Surviving test organisms were removed and preserved in 8% sugar formalin solution for growth measurements. Dry weight measurements were used to estimate growth. Dry weight of the test organisms were determined by pooling all living organisms from a replicate and drying the sample at about 60 to 90 deg C to a constant weight. The sample was brought to room temperature in a desiccator and weighed to obtain mean weight per surviving organism per replicate. Survival and growth in control treatments must be greater than or equal to 80% at the end of the test for acceptable test results.

#### 5.2.3 Sample Processing Method Calibration

NA

#### 5.2.4 Sample Processing Quality Control

Samples were stored at 4 deg C when collected and shipped on ice. Sediment toxicity samples were stored in the dark at 4 deg C until analysis.

Sediment samples were thoroughly mixed and added to the test chamber.

#### 5.2.5 Sample Processing Method Reference

U. S. EPA . 1994. Methods for Measuring the Toxicity and Bioaccumulation of Sediment-associated Contaminants with Freshwater Invertebrates. U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Duluth, MN. EPA/600/R-94/024.

#### 5.2.6 Sample Processing Method Deviations

None

### 6. DATA ANALYSIS AND MANIPULATIONS

Mean test and control replicate survival and growth were determined as a basis for relevant data manipulations.

#### 6.1 Name of New or Modified Values

SURVIVAL  
AVERAGE GROWTH

#### 6.2 Data Manipulation Description

##### 6.2.1 SURVIVAL

The values under SURVIVAL represent a comparison of the mean test survival to the mean control survival.

##### 6.2.2 AVERAGE GROWTH

The values under AVERAGE GROWTH represent the mean dry weight per surviving organism per replicate.

#### 6.3 Data Manipulation Examples

##### 6.3.1 SURVIVAL

$((\text{Mean \% Test Survival} / \text{Mean \% Control Survival}) * 100)$

##### 6.3.2 AVERAGE GROWTH

$(\text{Mean Weight} / \text{Surviving Organism} / \text{Replicate})$

### 7. DATA DESCRIPTION

#### 7.1 Description of Parameters

#	Name	Type	Length	Format	Parameter Label
1	STA_NAME	Char	10	10.	Station Name
2	DATE	Num	6	YYMMDD6.	Date sample collected

## 7.1 Description of Parameters, continued

#	Name	Type	Length	Format	Parameter Label
3	SPECIES	Char	18	\$18	Test species
4	SURV	Num	5	3.1	% Survival (Sample Mean as % of Control)
5	AVG_GRW	Num	5	1.3	Average growth (mg)

### 7.1.1 Precision to which values are reported

Survival values are reported to one decimal point and average growth values are reported to three decimal points.

### 7.1.2 Minimum Value in Data Set

SURV            0  
AVG\_GRW       0

### 7.1.3 Maximum Value in Data Set

SURV           100  
AVG\_GRW       1.424

## 7.2 Data Record Example

### 7.2.1 Column Names for Example Records

STA_NAME	DATE	SPECIES	SURV	AVG_GRW
----------	------	---------	------	---------

### 7.2.2 Example Data Records

LS94-76401	940816	Hyalella azteca	100	0.058
LS94-77980	940816	Hyalella azteca	95	0.056

## 8. GEOGRAPHIC AND SPATIAL INFORMATION

### 8.1 Minimum Longitude

-91 deg 43.516' W

### 8.2 Maximum Longitude

-84 deg 45.036' W

### 8.3 Minimum Latitude

46 deg 26.420' N

### 8.4 Maximum Latitude

47 deg 18.180' N

### 8.5 Name of Area or Region

Nearshore Lake Superior

Stations were located along the southern shore of the Nearshore resource class of Lake Superior from Duluth, Minnesota to Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan. Nearshore sites were located within the 100 meter depth contour. The area includes Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.



## 9. QUALITY CONTROL/QUALITY ASSURANCE

### 9.1 Measurement Quality Objectives

The required control data for sediment toxicity testing using a reference toxicant should have LC50 values falling within 2 standard deviations of the mean.

### 9.2. Data Quality Assurance Procedures

QA/QC procedures for sediment toxicity tests involved sample handling and storage, source and condition of test organisms, condition and operation of equipment, test conditions, instrument calibration, replication, use of reference toxicants, record keeping, and data evaluation. The organisms used in the tests were healthy and positively identified species. If greater than 10% of the organisms in holding containers were dead or appeared unhealthy during the 48 hours preceding a test, the entire group was discarded.

### 9.3 Actual Measurement Quality

## 10. DATA ACCESS

### 10.1 Data Access Procedures

Data can be downloaded from the EMAP Website.

### 10.2 Data Access Restrictions

Not applicable.

### 10.3 Data Access Contact Persons

Stephen J. Lozano  
U. S. E. P. A. NHEERL-MED  
(218) 529- 5205  
(218) 529- 5003 (FAX)  
lozano.stephen@epa.gov

### 10.4 Data Set Format

Data from the Website are in ASCII fixed format.

### 10.5 Information Concerning Anonymous FTP

Not accessible.

### 10.6 Information Concerning WWW

Data can be downloaded from the EMAP Website.

### 10.7 EMAP CD-ROM Containing the Data Set

Data are not available on CD-ROM

## 11. REFERENCES

Hedtke, S., A. Pilli, D. Dolan, G. McRae, B. Goodno, R. Kreis, G. Warren, D. Swackhamer, and M. Henry. 1992. Great Lakes Monitoring and Research Strategy: Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program USEPA, Office of Research and Development, ERL-Duluth, Duluth, Minnesota. EPA/602/R-92/001. 204 p.

## 12. TABLE OF ACRONYMS

None

## 13. PERSONNEL INFORMATION

Stephen J. Lozano  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
NHEERL-MED  
6201 Congdon Blvd  
Duluth, MN 55804  
(218) 529-5205  
(218) 529-5003 (FAX)  
lozano.stephen@epa.gov

Gary L. Phipps  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
NHEERL-MED  
6201 Congdon Blvd  
Duluth, MN 55804  
(218) 529-5205  
(218) 529-5003 (FAX)  
phipps.gary@epa.gov

Jill V. Scharold  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
NHEERL-MED  
6201 Congdon Blvd  
Duluth, MN 55804  
(218) 529-5205  
(218) 529-5003 (FAX)  
scharold.jill@epa.gov

Floyd L. Boettcher  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
NHEERL-MED  
6201 Congdon Blvd  
Duluth, MN 55804  
(218) 529-5205  
(218) 529-5003 (FAX)  
boettcher.floyd@epa.gov